

THE *Band. 20*
New Arian Reprov'd:
OR, A
VINDICATION
Of some REFLECTIONS on the
Conduct of Mr. *Whiston*,
In his Revival of the
Arian HERESY;
FROM
Mr. *Whiston's* late *Animadversions*,
inserted in his *Second Reply to Dr.*
ALLIX.

TOGETHER
With an Examination of some Passages
in his late *Account of the Proceedings of*
Convocation, and some other of his *Wri-*
tings, relating to the same Subject.

By the Author of those REFLECTIONS.

ὅς περὶ ἐρήκαμεν, καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω, ἔτι τις ὑμᾶς
εὐαγγελίζεσθαι παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

S. Paulus in Epist. ad Galat. c. i. v. 9.

LONDON: printed for Timothy Childe, at the *White-Hart*,
at the West-End of St. Paul's Church-yard. 1711.

THE
NEW AFRICAN REVIEW

OR A
VINDICATION
OF SOME REFLECTIONS

Condensed by Mr. W. Wilson
In the Year 1810

AND
FROM

Mr. Wilson's late African Review
inserted in his General Review
1811

TOGETHER
With an Examination of some
of his late African Review
Observations, and a
reply to the same



By the Author of the
African Review
Printed by W. Wilson, at the
African Review, No. 1, St. Paul's Church-yard, London.

A VINDICATION

OF

Some *Reflections*. on Mr. Whiston's *Conduct*, &c.

AS the rude Treatment of the Author of the *Reflections* on Mr. Whiston, in that Gentleman's late angry *Reply*, is a sufficient Justification of that Author's Opinion, with regard to the *false shews of Meekness, Humility, and love of Truth*, he had before detected in Mr. *Whiston's Conduct*; so is he obliged to Mr. *Whiston* for supplying him with New Instances, in his hasty *Animadversions*, of the want of those Qualifications that are requisite in one that sets up for a Reformer of the Christian Faith in its most Distinguishing Articles. The *Reflector* had been so hardy as to Doubt of Mr. *Whiston's* Sufficiency, both with relation to his stock of Ecclesiastical Learning, and Sincerity in the management

*Second
Reply to
Dr. Allix,
p. 31, &c.*

of it ; and therefore he might fairly expect some share of Mr. *Whiston's* Indignation, tho' none of that Dirt and Filth that has been thrown about him, by one that has made so ill a Use of a liberal Education. It was the avow'd Design of that Writer, how much soever Misrepresented by Mr. *Whiston*, to shew what just and reasonable Prejudices were entertain'd against Mr. *Whiston's* Undertaking ; and agreeably to this Design, he enter'd only so far into the Argumentative part of the Controversy, as was necessary to lay open the disingenuous Artifices of Mr. *Whiston*. And in that Attempt, he plainly confined himself to what Mr. *Whiston* has been pleased to communicate to the World out of his Manuscript Papers ; but never pretended to Answer MSS. with the sight of which that Author has been never favour'd, as Mr. *Whiston* is willing to intimate. That indeed would have been an Absurdity worthy of Mr. *Whiston's* Animadversions, if there had been the least Foundation for it ; but it is Notorious, that all that was aimed at by the Writer of those *Reflections* is, in the very Nature of it, *previous* to a full and accurate Examination of Mr. *Whiston's Collections* ; which, no doubt, will not be wanting, when they shall be made Publick. In the mean time, as it was very proper the World should be informed what are the Qualifications of that Person, who

Second Re-
ply to Dr.
Allix, p.
37.

who is so warmly engaged in Undermining our most Holy Faith ; so is it perfectly foreign to the present Dispute, whether Mr. *Whiston* makes a right Conjecture of the Discoverer of those Defects in his *Conduct*. He is pleased to Wonder, that those *Reflections* ib. p. 31. should come from one that has long known him, and till very lately thought him honest and sincere. Now, the Author of the *Reflections* thinks fit to disclaim all pretence to the Honour of having contracted a Friendship with Mr. *Whiston* ; He professes, he was never favour'd with any thing more of that kind, than a few accidental Conversations with him, that gave the *Reflector* such Ideas of his Temper and Notions, that he was never fond of any approaches towards an Intimacy with him. 'Tis true indeed, the *Reflector* was formerly, tho' not so very lately as Mr. *Whiston* imagines, one of those well-meaning Persons he mentions in his *Reflections*, who p. 4. had entertain'd too favourable an Opinion of that Author ; but as he was himself Disabused by Time and Experience, so has he endeavour'd to Disabuse others by the Reasons given in those *Reflections*. As Mr. *Whiston* has in process of Time changed his Opinion of some Things, so he must pardon Others if they change their Opinion of some Persons also, upon a clearer View and deeper Observation. With reference to all the harsh Expressions of Contempt thrown out upon the *Reflector*

Reflector in the *Animadversions* on him, that Author owns he despises them with the same degree of Scorn and Contempt with which they are offer'd; how much soever he may pity the Writer of them, as a Person that labours under the Mechanical Necessity of an Uncorrected Acrimony of Blood, and an over-heated Imagination. 'Tis pleasant, however, to observe, in what a continued fit of Passion Mr. *Whiston* reprehends the *Reflector* for the just Zeal he has expressed for so good a Cause; and that whilst he recommends Meekness to his Adversaries, he has drawn himself in the most Disagreeable Posture of Rage to all Posterity. But as the *Reflector* knows how to neglect Mr. *Whiston's* late harmless Insult upon the Reputation of one that has enjoy'd at least equal Advantages of a Learned Education with himself, so will he never be influenced by any of Mr. *Whiston's* haughty Airs and Magisterial Menaces, to submit in any respect to his pretended Superiority. And as the *Reflector* is not conscious to himself, that he has misapplied or abused those advantages of Education that Providence has favour'd him with, the Candid Reader will pardon him, if he assumes a little upon Mr. *Whiston's* Arrogance and Contempt.

After this Prefatory Apology, I shall omit what is merely Personal, as being both Unacceptable, and Uninstructive to the Reader,
and

and shall now Reply to every thing that may be thought Material in Animadversions that are really so very superficial, and betray so much Insincerity in their Author.

Mr. *Whiston* pretends (in the beginning of his Animadversions) that he meant no defiance to the Convocation, when he Dedicated his *Historical Preface* to that Learned Body. But can any Reader be found so very credulous, as to believe Mr. *Whiston* designed a real Respect to this Church and her Convocation, when he had the Confidence to impute Anti-Christianism to them; to put Purgatory and Transubstantiation on the same Foot with the Established Faith; to demand the alteration of the received Articles, Creeds, and Liturgy; to asperse those of the Clergy that have perused his Papers, with the Charge of Insincerity; and to declare, that all his Productions in this Dispute are Unanswerable by the Learned, whom he supposes to act merely upon Worldly Motives; and above all, to traduce the present Canon of the New Testament as Incomplete and Defective, and to consider *Constitutions* of a Doubtful Original, as the most Sacred part of Holy Scripture? If, I say, the Dedication of these Positions can be consider'd as a real Respect, and not as a solemn Defiance of the Clergy in Convocation, Mr. *Whiston* must be allow'd to be Master of peculiar

Second Reply to Dr. Allix, p. 31.

Ibid.

Hist. Pref. p. 83. 75. 73, 74.

113.

Append. p. 37.

liar Rules of Respect and Civility, or to Change the Propriety of the *English* Language in the same proportion as he endeavours to corrupt the Christian Faith.

Reflections
on Mr.
Whiston,
p. 4.

Second Re-
ply to Dr.
Allix, p. 32.

Ibid.

Ibid.

Mr. *Whiston* had been charged with want of Modesty, in pretending to alter the whole Scheme of the Christian Religion, upon so late and small an acquaintance with Ecclesiastical Antiquity. Now, how does Mr. *Whiston* reply to this Objection? Why truly, by confessing the Matter of Fact, as the *Reflector* had urged it against him. He owns in express Words, that he spent but four or five Months in his researches of the two first Centuries, and in writing the account of the *Primitive Faith*, which he communicated in *MS.* to a few of the Learned. He gives us, as he says, this *History of Facts*, without the least boasting or assuming. In this Article I joyn issue with him, and easily allow, that such avow'd Negligence is far from being a matter to be boasted of; nor can any Man in his Senses, pretend to argue from the, *Fathers*, and assume upon such a slight imperfect View of so many antient Authors, unless he can prove, that no other Quality is requisite to obtain Success but *Expedition*; or that a Man that rides in post-hast through a Country, is the fittest Person in the World to write the Geography of it, and make Observations on the Religion and Politicks of its Inhabitants. But since Mr. *Whiston* is pleased

fed to assert, "That if one would give a true
 " account of what the Antients really say, the
 " Work may be quickly gone thro', because
 " the first Obvious Sense of Words is to be
 " generally taken, I shall consider the nota-
 ble Reason he offers for his not dwel-
 ling longer on the Writings of the Fathers.
 To maintain this judicious Paradox, it must
 be asserted, that it is to very little purpose to
 consider with care the main scope and de-
 sign of any Writer, to be Master of *his* Prin-
 ciples, as well as those of his *Adversary*, and
 to understand his Dialect and peculiar Lan-
 guage. For Instance, Will not all that the
 most ancient *Irenæus* has wrote against the
 Hereticks of his Age, appear Unintelligible,
 and his Arguments lose their force and Au-
 thority, unless one has formed right Notions
 of the *Gnostical* Principles laid down in his
 two first Books? How absurdly will *Tertul-
 lian* at first View be thought to Argue a-
 gainst the *Valentinians* and the rest of the He-
 reticks he attacks, till one is become by long
 use Master of his and their particular Phra-
 ses and Notions, and consequently is taught
 to apprehend the strength of his Argu-
 ments? How soever rapid a Progress Mr.
Whiston may pretend to make in his Stu-
 dies of those Writers, whose Language and
 way of Reasoning are very remote and dif-
 ferent from those of the present Age, all
 modest Men must confess that they fre-
 quently

quently meet with great Difficulties in the perusal of them, and that upon farther Examination, the first obvious sense they put upon them was far from being the true one. And indeed it must necessarily happen, that there will be abundance of Ambiguity in Expressions, and Difficulty in the Arguments, of Men that embraced Christianity with all their *Stoical* or *Platonick* Phrases and Notions about them, and endeavoured to accommodate their former Language and Principles to their New Religion. And therefore the antient Fathers have, almost all of them, not only wrote in different Dialects from one another, but upon different Schemes of Principles, that require more severe Study than Mr. *Whiston* has allow'd himself, or thinks due from Others. He is pleased to affirm, that whoever bestows *much time* upon them, does so in order to *pervert them*; but I shall take the liberty to assert, that whoever follows the first Obvious Sense of Mystical and Allegorical Writers, as many of the Fathers were, consults indeed his own Ease, but will frequently mistake their Meaning, and run into innumerable Errors.

Ibid.

p. 4. The *Reflector* had produced *Tertullian*, as an Instance of Difficulty in Understanding the Fathers, as well as of Orthodoxy, within Mr. *Whiston's* Period of Time. To this

Second Reply to Dr. Allix, p. 32.

Mr. *Whiston* Replies, that *with regard to time*
Tertullian

Tertullian was later than the Authors he mainly insisted on. It seems, that notwithstanding his late *Advice* to study the Fathers of the three first Centuries, he has thought fit to confine his Collection of Testimonies to the Fathers of the two first Ages, and decently to drop the third that abounded with Evidence against him. But to omit the Discussion of that Point, Tertullian, who flourished for some time, and wrote several Treatises, before the expiration of the second Century, must now be Discarded as Unserviceable to Mr. Whiston's Cause, tho' within the compais of Time prescribed by him. Thus to evade the force of Tertullian's Testimony, Mr. Whiston roundly pronounces him an *Heretick*, and so there was no occasion for reading him more exactly. This sounds but oddly in one that is himself accused of *Heresy*, and is an Apology that Mr. Whiston would scarce admit in his own Case, as he is an Author. However, he assures us, he has read the proper Parts of Tertullian, in the short space assign'd by him for his study of the Fathers. Now, whatever parts of Tertullian's Works Mr. Whiston might peruse as proper for the service of his Cause, and whatever Errors about the Paraclete Tertullian fell into, 'tis certain that Tertullian acknowledg'd the Consubstantial Nature of the Son of God, and adhered to the Doctrine of the ever

*Adv. for
stud. of
Div. p.
257.*

*Second
Reply to
Dr. Allix,
p. 32.
Ibid.*

bleſſed Trinity, *after* his laſe into *Montaniſm*, as well as *before* it. Even after he ſeparated from the Church in Matters of *Discipline*, he maintain'd the true *Doctrine* of it.

*De Pudi-
cit. Fejun-
monogamia
C. Prax.*

This is evident from his Books wrote after his Separation. In which, tho' he inſiſts upon greater Severities than were uſually practiſed, yet he profeſſed the ſame Unvaried Faith to the end of his Life, and there was no Diſpute between that *Heretick Tertullian* and the Catholick Church about the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghoſt. Ignorance therefore, or Inſincerity, muſt be here charged upon Mr. *Whiſton*: If the former only, his Learned Adverſary Dr. *Allix*, will ſet him right, whenever Mr. *Whiſton* will vouchſafe to peruſe his excellent *Differtation on the Life and Writings of Tertullian*, in which the Chronology as well as Orthodoxy of his Works, with relation to the preſent Subject of Diſpute, are fully eſtabliſhed.

*Second Re-
ply to Dr.
Allix, p.
33.*

Mr. *Whiſton* is pleaſed to add, “ that the *Reſpecter* impoſes groſſly on his Reader, “ when he quotes the *Hiſtorical Preface* for “ the following Words, *My Evidence for the “ Sacred Autherity of the Apoſtolical Conſtitu- “ tion, on a little Enquiry, became moſt Un- “ queſtionable*. But what juſt occaſion has herein been given for ſo rude a Censure? Are not theſe very Words extant in *Hiſt. Pref.* the *Hiſtorical Preface*? Has not the *Re- p. 115.* *ſpecter* quoted the very Page? Can he be pre- ſumed

sumed to have designed to put a Trick up-
 on the Reader, when he refers him to the
 very place where these Words are used, and
 left him freely to Determine for what Rea-
 sons, as there assign'd, Mr. *Whiston* thought
 fit to say, " The Sacredness of the Aposto-
 " lical Constitutions, on a *little Enquiry*,
 " became Unquestionable. For all the Use the
Reflector has made of that Quotation, is to
 shew, that Mr. *Whiston* acknowledges his
 own Unaccuracy, even in fixing the Autho-
 rity of a pretended Sacred Book ; as he there
 does by an *Arabick* version of what he calls
the Doctrine of the Apostles. What Mr. *Whi-*
ston's Enquiries about the Constitutions had
 been before, he does not pretend to Determine;
 but he thought Mr. *Whiston* deserved some
Animadversion, when upon so little Autho-
 rity as he could possibly have for the Genu-
 ineness of the *Arabick Doctrine of the Apo-*
stles, his evidence for the Sacred Authority of
the Constitutions, upon a *little Enquiry* became
 most Unquestionable. I cannot therefore see
 how Mr. *Whiston* gains any Advantage by
 venting this Calumny of the *Reflector's* de-
 signing to abuse his Reader (a thing he ab-
 hors and detests) unless it may be called an
 Advantage to Mr. *Whiston's* Cause, thus to
 own, that he built the Authority of one *spu-*
rious Book upon that of another ; namely, that
 upon a *little Enquiry* into the *Arabick*
Doctrine of the Apostles, he Discover'd that
 to

See Dr.
Grabe's
Essay on
Arab.
MSS.

to be a genuine *Sacred Book*, and then upon another *little Enquiry* found the *Sacred Authority* of the *Constitutions* to be most Unquestionable. And indeed the Learned Dr. *Grabe* has lately shewn, to Mr. *Whiston's* Conviction, (if he were capable of it) how very *little* that Enquiry was.

Second Re-
ply to Dr.
Allix, p. 34.

After this, Mr. *Whiston* in high resentment of the Affront offer'd to his *Theory of the Earth*, is pleased to throw out some Expressions of Diminution upon the *Reflector*, as no competent Judge of that Performance, and as one that has little Knowledge of that Work. By this Passage, Mr. *Whiston* does not seem to guess right at the *Reflector*, to whom he pretends he has been long known. For Mr. *Whiston* must otherwise have recollected what Conversation he has formerly had with that Author upon this very Subject. But whether he thinks fit to recollect it or not, the *Reflector* thinks himself obliged to assure Mr. *Whiston*, that as he formerly studied his *Theory* with some Care, for which he was prepared by having been Conversant in Sir *Isaac Newton's* incomparable *Principles*, so by more mature Reflection, as well as Mr. *Keil's* Examination of that Theory, he was at last (notwithstanding the Bias of some lucky Coincidences in it) convinced of the many great Defects of it, the recital of which would be improper in this Place. But since I charged Mr. *Whiston* with Mistakes in

Reflections
on Mr.
Whiston,
p. 7.

Hy.

Hydrostaticks, I beg (among the many Instances mentioned by Mr. Keil) he will consider, how it was possible that the Subterraneous Water (suppos'd to be half the Water necessary to the Deluge) could be pumped up through Fissures of two Miles perpendicular height; or if so, whether the Water could continue on the face of the Earth, *i. e. on the gaping Mouths* of those Fissures, to cause a gradual Deluge of 150 Days. But, since this was too absurd to be admitted, and his *Theory* was as much broken in pieces as his primitive Earth it self, Mr. Whiston has been pleased to mend and Tinker his Hypothesis; and after he had been justly lashed for his want of ordinary skill in *Hydrostaticks*, he found it necessary to alter his Scheme so far as to give up all his Fissures at once, as Unserviceable to the Deluge by the overflowing of the *Fountains of the great Deep*, tho' supposed equal to eleven Oceans; since more Water would return thro' those Fissures in 150 Days, than had ascended by them during the short Impetus of the incumbent Columns on the Subterranean Waters, as well as of the Extraordinary Tydes occasion'd by the Comet's approach. The *Reflector* had Consulted Mr. Whiston's *Second Edition* of his *Theory*, and must own that there is very little New in it about the Deluge, but a precarious *Consolidation* of the shatter'd Columns of the Earth, and a confession

See Keil's
Reflections
in 8vo.

sion of the little or no Use of the Subterraneous Water, on which so great a stress had before been laid, in order to avoid the imputation of *Hydrostatical* Blunders. This is the great Improvement of Mr. *Whiston's* *Second* Edition of his *Theory*, namely, that he has contradicted in it a very considerable part of the first. After all the industry that has been used to repair the Breaches of his ruinous *Theory*, it is at best but Patch-work. And tho' he has in effect laid aside one half of the quantity of Water at first assign'd by him for drowning the Earth, he cannot so much as carry off the remaining Half; but after all Corrections of his *Theory*, it must, without farther Assistance, continue Drowned for Ever. So that when Mr. *Whiston* refers us to the *Second* Edition of his *Theory*, he tacitly acknowledges the Errors of the first, and in other words confirms what the *Reflector* had said freely before, that Mr. *Whiston* at first pretended to Explain the Deluge without understanding *Hydrostaticks*.

But to return from this Digression, that has been occasioned by the arrogance of Mr. *Whiston*, in not allowing the *Reflector* to have a sufficient knowledge of his *Theory*, I shall now go on to evince the Truth of what the *Reflector* on his Conduct has charged him with, namely, that he has made as false Steps in his Study of *Ecclesiastical Antiquity*, as he formerly did in *Natural Philosophy*.

The *Reflector* on Mr. *Whiston's* Conduct Ref. p. 7.
 had imputed gross Partiality to him, with
 reference to the great and important Decision Ibid. p. 8,
 9, &c.
 of the Council of *Nice*. In Answer to which
 Charge, Mr. *Whiston* pretends, that he
thought this had not been his singular Case, but Second
 Rep. to Dr.
 Allix, p. 34.
that Bishop Bull, Dr. Grabe, &c. had been
 of the same Mind, that the *Ante-Nicene* Fa-
 thers *only* are the *best* Guides, next the Sa-
 cred Writings. In which Answer, the im-
 propriety of Style and weakness of Argu-
 ment are both of a Piece. As to exactness
 of Style, Can any thing be more nicely
 Penn'd than this Assertion, that the *Ante-*
Nicene Fathers *only* are the *best* Guides? Cer-
 tainly if they are the *best* Guides, they ought
 to be our *only* Guides. And if they *only* are
 our Guides, they must be our *best* Guides. But
 that they *only* are our *best* Guides, is a pecu-
 liar Elegancy of Mr. *Whiston*. But to pass
 over so unaccurate an Expression, 'tis won-
 derful how Mr. *Whiston* could affirm, that
 Bishop *Bull* and Dr. *Grabe* were of his Opi-
 nion in that Matter; since it was the pro-
 fessed Design of Bishop *Bull*, in his excellent
Defence of the Nicene Faith, to shew the exact
 agreement of the sentiments of the *Ante-*
Nicene Fathers with the *Nicene* Confession
 of Faith, and to establish the latter upon
 its Harmony with the former. And was
 not this too the very Design of this Learn-
 ed Annotator Dr. *Grabe*, who with this very
 View has supplied some Testimonies of the

Ante-Nicene Fathers, untouched by Bishop Bull, and defended others of his from all Objections? If therefore Mr. *Whiston* had perused Bishop Bull's incomparable *Work* on the *Nicene Faith* with that accuracy that it deserves, before he had vented his own crude Notions, he could never have fallen into so gross a Blunder, as to imagine, that Bishop Bull and Dr. Grabe ever thought, that the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers are our *only*, or our *best* Guides, in *Contra-distinction* to the *Nicene* Fathers, as they must be understood in Mr. *Whiston's* Position.

Ref. p. 9,
10.

Second
Rep. to Dr.
Al. p. 35.

The *Reflector* had shewn how great a Veneration is due to the Authority of the Council of *Nice*. To ballance which, Mr. *Whiston* is pleased to put together in the Scale the more antient Council of *Antioch*, and the three Councils of *Tyre*, *Jerusalem*, and *Constantinople*, which were very little later than that of *Nice*; all which, as he asserts, were directly against its Determination. Now, to shew that Mr. *Whiston* has misrepresented this whole Matter, and to disabuse those Readers that have been little conversant in Ecclesiastical History, I shall endeavour to place in a just Light the Weakness of this ballancing Argument. With reference to the Council of *Antioch*, it was not only Determined long ago by *Athanasius* himself, but has been lately with great Clearness evinced from him and other antient Fathers, (in the Learned

Vid. Ath.
de Synod.
Arim & Se-
leuc. Edit.
Benedict. p.
758. 759.

Answer

Answer to Mr. Whiston's Question about the word ὁμοούσιος, as rejected by the Council of Antioch) that the word ὁμοούσιος was not rejected in general by those Fathers, since it had been used in the Church long before, but that it was laid aside at that time upon account of the abusive Sense, namely, the *Sabellian* one, to which it was distorted from its native Signification, by *Paulus Samosatenus*. All addition to that *Answer* is therefore superseded. For if it is evident, that the Council of *Antioch* refused to use that Word only in the *bad* Sense of that Heretick, it by no means follows that the Councils of *Nice* and *Antioch* do in the least Clash or interfere with one another. The Authorities therefore that have been urged for the Council of *Antioch's* postponing the use of that Word in the *Sabellian* Sense, and not rejecting it at large, must be first invalidated by *Mr. Whiston*, before he can claim the Patronage of the Council of *Antioch*, consider'd in opposition to the Council of *Nice*.

See Dr. Allix's

Answer to Mr. Whiston's Reply, p. 104.

As to the Councils of *Tyre*, *Jerusalem*, and *Constantinople*, it is certain that their Determinations were not *directly* levelled against the *Nicene* Doctrine, but were *Personal* Matters founded on the implacable Malice of the *Eusebian* Party to *Athanasius* and his immediate Followers, whom they endeavour'd to sink and ruine, as well as to restore *Arius* to the Communion of the Church, by all the

base and subtle Arts of inveterate Enemies. To be more particular on this Occasion, (and I hope the Reader will pardon the mention of some *necessary* Particulars) we are assured, that the Council of Tyre did not meddle with the *Doctrine*, but the *Person* of *Athanasius*, whom they Condemned and Deposed for Immoralities and Profaneness falsely laid to his Charge, and never proved against him. Such as the Story of his killing *Arsenius*, and their producing his right Hand, tho' *Arsenius* himself was alive and openly shewn at the Council of Tyre. Such likewise was the ridiculous Charge of *Macarius*, a Presbyter of *Athanasius*, his breaking the Communion-Cup, and overthrowing the Communion-Table, in the Church of the Usurping *Ischyras*, at the Command of *Athanasius*, tho' *Ischyras* himself denied the Matter of Fact; and tho' the *Alexandrian* and *Mareotick* Clergy offer'd to vindicate *Athanasius* from those Imputations, but were repulsed by the Commissioners of the Council of Tyre. And I cannot here omit taking notice, that these are the very Crimes Mr. *Whiston* is not ashamed to Charge even yet on the Memory of that great Saint, *Athanasius*; and to vent the most Uncharitable Suspicions of his gross Dishonesty and horrible Wickedness in the most opprobrious Language, upon no better a foundation of Credibility than those Calum-

Vid. Sozomeni H.E. l. 2. c. 23. & 25.

Socrat. H. E. l. 1. c. 27, 29, & 32.

Vid. Athanas. Apol. 2. p. 134. 136, 137. 147. 181. Tom. 1. Ed. Ben.

Ibid. p. 147. 191. 194.

Hist. Pref. p. 101, &c.

Calumnies that were furbished up in this very Council of *Tyre*, by the Resentments of powerful Enemies but were solidly Confuted by the very Persons that were used as Instruments in the Prosecution of them. But to return from Mr. *Whiston* to *Athanasius*.

We find in Fact, that the Council of *Tyre* Vid. Socr. l. 1. c. 33. was adjourned to *Jerusalem*, to celebrate the Dedication of *Constantine's* famous Church lately erected in that Place; where, indeed, they were met by several Others. After the Solemnity of the Dedication was performed, the prodigious Easiness of *Constantine* (as *Monfaucon* justly calls it) was so much abused by Vid. Vitam Athan. p. 21. 26, 27. the repeated Addresses of the *Arian* Patroness, his Sister *Constantia*, and possibly by other Courtiers of that Party, that he was Vid. Theodoret, H. E. l. 1. c. 33. prevailed upon to recommend the Case of the banished *Arius* to the Consideration of the Synod of *Jerusalem*. He was pleased Sozom. l. 2. c. 27. too to declare, that if *Arius* would subscribe the *Nicene* Faith, he should be recalled, and sent home to *Alexandria*. *Arius* accordingly Ibid. apud Epist. Arii & Euzoii. gave in an Equivocating Confession of his Faith to the Emperor, in which he professed belief in God the Word, and the whole Trinity, agreeably to the form of Baptism prescribed by our Lord; not without denouncing an *Anathema* upon himself and Followers, if they did not Believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to the Faith of the *Catholick Church*. This Confession was

Vid. Socr.
l. c. 33.

was in consequence approved by the Synod, and *Arius* with his Followers was restored to Communion. So that as the Council of *Tyre* acted *Personally* against *Athanasius*, so the Council of *Jerusalem* acted *Personally* in favour of *Arius*, his declared Adversary. But

Second Rep.
to Dr. All.
p. 35.

will Mr. *Whiston* dare to affirm, that any *Doctrines* were settled in either of those Councils, directly against the Determination of the *Nicene Council*? Was the Dispute about the Word *ὁμοοσιον* so much as renew'd? Was it not the particular Business of both those Synods, consider'd as form'd Parties warmly pursuing their Resentments, to ruine *Athanasius*, and restore *Arius*? 'Tis obvious, that Matters of Faith were no otherwise concerned, than as an ambiguous Formulary of it, drawn up by the Perjured *Arius*, was approved of by the professed Enemies of *Athanasius*.

Vid. Soz.
l. 2. c. 27.

Pass we on then to the third Council Mr. *Whiston* appeals to by way of Ballance; namely, that of *Constantinople*, which we are assured, was occasion'd by *Athanasius's* application to *Constantine*, upon his Condemnation by the Council of *Tyre*, that he might not be ruin'd by the Malice of his Enemies, but might be allow'd a fair and impartial Hearing of his Cause. In which request as he

Vid. Ath.
Apol. 2. p.
131. 201,
202

Vid. Soz.
l. 2. c. 28.

was gratified by the Emperor, Orders were sent to the Synod then at *Jerusalem* to come and justify their Proceedings against *Athanasius*.

sus. The greater part, we are told, declined appearing at *Constantinople* in vindication of their Sentence, but *Eusebius* and a few of the chief of his Party went thither, *vid. Socr. H. E. l. 1. c. 35.* 'tis plain, under the Consciousness of Guilt, since they entirely dropt the Old Story of *Arsenius's* Hand, and the Eucharistical Cup, and boldly accused *Athanasius* of High-Treason before the Emperor, This was indeed a Master-piece of Villany, but which had no manner of relation to the *Nicene* Faith, but that of revenging themselves on the great Defender of it. And accordingly they gain'd their Point; for this Accusation made so strong an impression on the timorous Temper of *Constantine*, that he too easily gave Credit to it, and immediately Banished *Athanasius*, tho' he still retain'd his Faith: Which demonstratively proves, that the *Nicene* Faith was not here concerned. After which, these triumphant *Eusebians*, joyn'd by a few Others, held a Synod at *Constantinople*, in which they Condemned and Deposed *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, an intimate Friend of *Athanasius*; and would have insolently Celebrated the reception of *Arius* himself to the Communion of the Church, unless the Divine Vengeance had fallen upon that Incendiary in the Critical Juncture, and called him to a more impartial and just Tribunal. *vid. Socr. l. 1. c. 38.*

Ibid.

I have the longer detain'd the Reader with this Historical account of Mr. *Whiston's* *Ballancing* Councils, that he may the better judge whether they are fit to stand in Competition with the Great Council of *Nice*, in point of Authority; as likewise whether their Decrees were *directly against the Doctrinal Determinations* of the *Nicene* Council, or did principally, if not only, relate to particular Persons and Parties. The latter is the plain result of the fore-mention'd Facts, and consequently Mr. *Whiston's* Rival-Councils are found too light upon the Ballance; unless he is resolv'd to maintain a witty Paradox, and boldly assert, that the ἐμὸλοσιον was Condemned with *Athanasius*; that the *Personal* Crimes he was accused of inferred the falshood of his *Doctrine*, and his Banishment for High-Treason included a Confutation of that *Faith*, to which the Emperor notwithstanding this passionate Sentence, adhered to his dying Day.

It is observable likewise on this occasion, that these three Councils of *Tyre*, *Jerusalem*, and *Constantinople*, which Mr. *Whiston* so much boasts of, and opposes to the single one of *Nice*, ought in reality to be consider'd as but *One* Council; since it is evident that the whole Council of *Tyre* was Adjourned to *Jerusalem*, where (upon occasion of the Confluence to the Church's Dedication) having incorporated some additional Members in
that

that Synod, the chief Members of the *Eusebian* Party in it were summon'd to *Constantinople*, who, as has been before recited, wrought upon the Emperor's jealous Fears to that degree, as to procure the Banishment of *Athanasius*, before they sat *Synodically* in that Place. After which, with a small number added to them, the very same Persons were the Instruments of restoring *Arius* to Communion, and laid the Design of Triumphanting, with him, over the Catholick Church. So that the Authority of Mr. *Whiston's* Three Councils is, in effect, melted down into that of *One*; the principal Members of which carried on the same Design in Three different Places, whether several Accidents had conspired to bring them.

It is very surprizing, that Mr. *Whiston* Second Reply to Dr. Allix, p. 356 doubts not to give the preference to his *Ballancing* Councils, just now discoursed of, as compared with the *Nicene* Council, upon account of the *Partiality, Heats, and Hast*, that, as he asserts, *were so notorious in the latter*. For any Person that has consulted Ecclesiastical History, with a little more attention than Mr. *Whiston* seems to have done, is able to Confute with ease so groundless a Calumny. All the Proceedings of the Three Councils against *Athanasius*, seem to be nothing else but one continued series of a persecuting implacable Rage. Even the Great *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea* quitted his mild and moderate Character, when he sat in Judgment

Vid. Ath.
Apol. p.
195. &
Epiphan.
Hæres. 69.

at Tyre upon *Athanasius*, and broke out into an indecent Quarrel with the *Egyptian* Bishops that appear'd in his Vindication. The Barbarities of the *Tyrian* Commissioners in *Egypt*, in order to extort Confessions of the pretended Crimes of *Athanasius*, were beyond all Example. In confutation of the *Heats* and *Hast* that Mr. *Whiston* charges on the proceedings of the Council of *Nice*, I refer him to the unexceptionable Testimonies of *Constantine* and his own admired *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*. The former of whom, who Personally Presided in that Council, assures us, (a) " That every thing that could supply
" matter of Controversy, was accurately
" Discussed and Examined, before the *Nicene*
" Faith was agreed upon by common Con-
" sent. And the latter, whose Testimony Mr. *Whiston* on all other occasions would gladly acquiesce in, acquaints us, (b) that
the

(a) Ex *Constantini* Epistol. de Syn. Nic. apud *Eusebium* de vitâ *Constantini*, l. 3: c. 17. Edit. *Vales*

Ἀπαντα τῆς προσηκούσης τελευτήκεν ἐξελάσεως, ἄχρεις ἔη τῷ πάντων ἐφόρῳ θεῷ ἀρέσκουσα γνώμη πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἐνό- τητος συμφωνίαν εἰς φῶς περὶχθῇ. ὥς μηδὲν ἔτι πρὸς διχονοίαν ἢ πίστει ἀμφισβήτησιν ὑπολείπεσθαι.

Idem in Epistol. ad Eccl. Alex. apud *Socrat.* H. E. l. i. c. 9.

Ἠλέγχθη γὰρ ἅπαντα, καὶ ἀκραιῶς ἐξηλάσται, ὅσα δι ἀμβολίας ἢ διχονοίας πρόφασιν ἐδύκει γεννᾶν.

(b) Ex *Euseb.* Cæsar. Epist. ad Cæsar. Eccles. ap. *Socr.* l. i. c. 8.

- Ἡ [πίστει] συνεφωνήσαμεν πάντες ἐκ ἀνεξελάστας. τὸ τῷ πατρὶ ὁμοσίον ἐκ ἀνεξέταστον αὐτοῖς καταλιμπάνο- μεν. ἐπερωτήσεις τοιγαρὲν καὶ ἀποκρίσεις ἐντευθεν ἀνεκ- νῆντο, ἐβασανίζεν τε ὁ λόγος τὴν διάνοισιν τῶν ἐισημέ- νων. Et quæ sequuntur sub finem Epistolæ.

“the Council of *Nice* did not rashly and without due examination subscribe the *ὁμολογίαν*; and that there were various Questions and Replies about the true Sense and Meaning of that Word, which was so accurately weighed that he himself subscribed that Faith.” As for the first appearances of *Heat*, they were soon allay’d by the Prudence and candor of the Emperour, as the same *Eusebius* informs us.

Vid. Euseb. Cas. de vita Constant. l. 3. c. 13.

But since Mr. *Whiston* is pleased to Object too great *Hast* to the *Nicene* Council, in their Proceedings, and as an Instance of it to assert, “That the doubtful Creed it established was done with so little Deliberation, that it was Signed the very *same* Day that the Council met, I shall so far gratify Mr. *Whiston* as to think *this Circumstance* worthy of my Enquiry, and at the same time endeavour to place it in a true Light. His Authority for this Assertion is that of the Learned *Monfaucon*, in his Life of *Athanasius*. But I should have expected on this occasion, that so great a pretender to Antiquity would not have condescended to Cite a Modern Writer, in justification of so great a Mistake, but would have derived all his Authorities, relating to an antient Matter of Fact, immediately from the Fountains themselves. He would then have been sensible of the Defects of *Monfaucon*’s too compendious account of the *Nicene* Council in the fore-mention’d

Second Reply to Dr. Allix, p. 35.

Ibid.

Vid. vitam
Athan.
p. 9.

Vid. Socr.
H. E. l. i.
c. 8. &
Sozom.
l. i. c. 17,
18, 19.

Life. For that Writer has too superficially touched upon the several Disputes that were *previous* to the Determination of that Council, and all those Debates about *Arius's* Doctrine, as well as about the *ὑποθέσις*, as are implied in *Eusebius's* acknowledgment of their accuracy, and the multiplied *Questions* and *Replies* he mentions; a particular account of which we cannot now expect, since the *Original Acts* of the Council of *Nice* are unhappily lost. The 19th of *June* might indeed be the first and the last Synodical Session, in the strict Sense of the Word, with reference to the drawing up the *Nicene Creed*. But this Concession by no means excludes the *preparatory* Debates of the Bishops and Others upon the Rule of Faith, and *Arius's* particular Doctrine, for several Days together, before their final Determination on the 19th of *June*. And that this is no Hypothesis invented to solve a Difficulty, but undoubted Matter of Fact, the Historians above-Cited make very evident. It is not only impossible in the nature of the thing, that so many Disputes could be held, *Arius* examin'd and confuted, and the various *Explications* of the *ὑποθέσις* consider'd, within the narrow compass of *one Day*; but it is clear, upon the Authority of *Eusebius* himself,

* that

* that the Bishops (who seem before to have assembled at the Church in the previous Debates) met in the Palace on the Day appointed to decide the Controversies that had been agitated. The plain meaning of which is, that in the Decisive Session of the Council with reference to *Arius*, they waited on the Emperor at his Palace, and presented him with the Result of all that that they had discussed and examined for several Days, and deliberately comprized their Determination in that Form drawn up by the famous *Hosius*, which has since been called the *Nicene Creed*. And that this is the true account of the decision of the Council of *Nice*, I have the Concurring Judgment of that Excellent Critick in Ecclesiastical History, *H. Valesius*; a Person of that Sagacity, *Vid. Annot. in Eusebium de vit. Const. l. 3. c. 10.* and so very Conversant in Church-Antiquities, that I shall not scruple to prefer his Opinion in the present Case to that of *Monfaucon*, tho' a very Learned Man, but that perhaps did not think himself oblig'd to give us all Particulars relating to the *Nicene Council*, whilst he was engaged in Writing a *Single Life*. I hope what has now been said may induce *Mr. Whiston* to consider

* Ex Euseb. de vita Constantini, l. 3. c. 10.

Ἐπεὶ δ' ἡμέρας δευτέρης τῇ συνόδῳ, καθ' ἣν χρὴ λύσιν ἐπιθεῖναι τοῖς ἀμφισβητούμενοις, παρὴν ἕκαστος τὰυτὴν ἄγω· ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ μεσασιάτῳ οἴκῳ τῶν βασιλέων.

der how rashly he has accused the *Nicene Council* of immoderate *Heat* and *Hast*; and I wish he would be so impartial, as to pay the same Respect to the Learned *Monfaucon's* Authority upon all other Occasions in his *Life*, and *Notes* upon the Works, of the great *Athanasius*.

It ought likewise to be consider'd in favour of the Council of *Nice*, by way of Inference from what has been already Discourfed on occasion of the foremention'd *Arian Councils*, that, as it was the *First* General Council, the Doctrine it establish'd was Decreed by Persons call'd *indifferently* from all parts of the Christian World, very soon after the Dispute arose, and before Men's Passions were universally inflamed; and consequently the Doctrine it self must be pure and untainted with Prejudices, and derived in an immediate Channel from Apostolical Tradition, as founded on the written Word of God, without any Humane Sophistication. This must be allowed to be a vast Advantage, when we Consider, that before the Councils of *Tyre*, *Jerusalem*, and *Constantinople*, tho' they should be thought to be *Three* Distinct ones, deep Prejudices were imbibed, angry Parties were formed, Political Interests were mixed with Theological Enquiries, and Personal Resentments were violently aggravated, and implacably pursu'd. And, therefore, if it were even admitted that

that *Doctrinal* as well as *Personal* Determinations had been made in those succeeding Synods in favour of *Arianism*, it must highly Detract from the Reverence due to those Determinations, when we Consider, that they came into the World under such Disadvantages, as must be own'd to be far from being favourable to Truth and Impartiality.

Mr. *Whiston* was pleased to acknowledge vin. of The-
ory of the
Earth. p.
27. & 28. some Years ago, that “ he neither was, nor
“ pretended to be, Master of much Skill in
“ the History of Learning; and that his
“ own Studies and Inclinations had lain ano-
“ ther way. And I wish he had not given
the World too much reason to apply what
he own'd in general of the *History of Learn-*
ing, to his Knowledge of the *History* of the
Church of Christ. But *Ignorance* is a more
innocent Charge than the *Insincerity* he has
betray'd on several Occasions, and particu-
larly in what he mentions next in his *Reply*, Second Rep.
to Dr. All.
p. 35. which shall now come under immediate
Examination.

The *Reflector* on Mr. *Whiston's Conduct* Ref. p. 12.
had ventur'd to assert, That Mr. *Whiston*
was insincere, in declaring that it was never
his Intention to revive the *Arian Heresy*, Lett. to A.
B. April.
5. 1711. as it was condemn'd by the Council of Nice.
For the proof of which Assertion having
collected the Remains of *Arius*, and his im-
mediate Followers, that were wrote before
the

Reflect. p.
13 & 14. the Council of *Nice*, and compar'd them with Mr. *Whiston's Propositions of Faith*, he made it evident to all the World, that there is an exact agreement between the Doctrine of *Arius* and Mr. *Whiston*; which was the thing denied in exprefs Terms by Mr. *Whiston*. The Reflector likewise had shewn, that tho'

Reflect. p.
15 & 16. Mr. *Whiston* pretended to be only a *Moderate Arian*, yet he was (according to his own Confession elsewhere) one that subscribes the *Eunomian Creed*; which carried *Arianism* to that height, that the *Moderate Arians* of the Fourth Century refused Communion with the *Eunomian Party*. And this fully appear'd from a Comparison of Mr. *Whiston's Propositions of Faith* with *Eunomius's Confession* it self. To all which,

Second
Rep: to D.
All. p: 35. Mr. *Whiston* thinks fit thus to Reply, " Then our Author proceeds to prove, that I am one of the Heretical *Arians*; nay, that I am an *Eunomian*, or most compleat *Arian*. Pray, Sir, What is all this to the Purpose?—Whence he goes on to own himself an *Arian*, even of the *Eunomian* kind.

Ibid. I refer the Reader to his own Words, that I may not be tedious in Transcribing him. Now that this Answer of his is an elaborate Misrepresentation, in order to Disguise the Insincerity that was prov'd upon him, is most clear and evident. For he must needs be sensible, that the *Reflector* did not Charge him with agreeing with *Arius*, or being

being an *Eunomian*, without any farther View.

His business was to evince from that very Charge (the Truth of which is here confess'd) that Mr. *Whiston* was guilty of great *Insincerity*, in declaring that he does not revive the *Herefy of Arius*, as condemned by the Council of Nice; and that he is only a *Moderate Arian*. *Second Reply* p. 35.

This therefore was to the purpose, tho' Mr. *Whiston's* Reply is far from being so. For if the *Reflector* has plainly proved, by a particular Collation, that Mr. *Whiston's* Doctrine agrees with that of *Arius*, tho' he pretends to condemn it as *Novel*; and if he confesses he

is an *Eunomian*, tho' he elsewhere denies he is any other than a *Moderate Arian*; it must be granted, that Mr. *Whiston* has given a Prevaricating Answer, and has really said on this occasion *nothing to the purpose*, or what is *Worse*. *Lett. to the A. B. Ap.* 5. 1711.

At the least, he has been guilty of a plain Contradiction; since it is impossible he should be a *Moderate Arian* and an *Eunomian* at the same time. For the *Eunomians* asserted, that the Son is absolutely *Unlike* to God the Father; and the Body of the *Eusebians* or common *Arians* own'd that he is *like* to him; and therefore they refused to Communicate with the *Eunomians*. This is well known to all that understand any thing of the History of the 4th Century. The Confusion, therefore, with which Mr. *Whiston* has treated of two Things so very Distinct as *Eunomianism* and common *Arianism*,

E

(which

(which he elsewhere stiles the *Moderate* kind) must either arise from his real Ignorance of Ecclesiastical Antiquity, or a design to impose on his less skilful Readers. But I rather insist on my former Charge of *Insincerity* in this very Article, and am sorry to find it so well proved by Mr. *Whiston* himself, with the additional guilt of so evasive an Answer.

See p. 45,
and 46.

Of which sort of Behaviour, I wish Mr. *Whiston* had not given us a new Instance, on this very Subject, in his late bold *Account of the Proceedings of Convocation*; in which to avoid the *Nicene Anathema*, as well as a *Legal Censure* founded on that of *Nice*, he Refines upon his own Doctrine to that degree, as to declare he has not entirely *denied the Consubstantiality of the Son*, or fully *affirmed* that our *Saviour was made or Created by the Father*, namely, *in that Sense in which the Council of Nice established the one and condemned the other*. Is not this a surprizing Concession from Mr. *Whiston*? What well-meaning Reader would not at first view believe, that Mr. *Whiston* is on a sudden grown very *Orthodox*? But for the Proof of this he refers us to his MS. Papers, and is pleased here to shelter himself from the *Legal Punishment of Heresy*, by the *loose explications* of the word *ὁμοούσιος*, given by the Fathers of the Council of *Nice* to the Hesitating *Eusebius*. But these *loose explications*, as he calls them, really amount to no more than this, that the *Consubstantiality* is not to be understood

Vid. Socr.
H. E. l. i.
c. 8.

derstood in a Sense taken from the Nature of Body, or any of its *Affections*. So that I cannot see how he is at all skreened by those Negative Explications, tho' he acknowledges he *is not sure but that the Consubstantial Doctrine may be true in some sense or other.* *Proc. of Convoc. p. 67.*

He is pleased likewise to add, that those *only* are Anathematized by the *Nicene Council*, that directly affirm, that the Son is of *another Substance* and *another Essence* from the Father, which he is sure he has *no where done in any of his Papers*. But besides that it is very evident, that the Son must necessarily be either of the *same Substance* with, or of *another Substance* from, the Father ; and that therefore there is a strict relation between the Son's being confessed in the *Nicene Creed* to be of the *same Substance* with the Father, and being denied in the Appendix to it to be of *another Substance* from the Father, the maintainers of which last opinion are there Anathematized ; I say, to pass by this Connexion at present, what is more plain and obvious, than that Mr. *Whiston* imposes here *very grossly* on his Reader, whom he had more than once acquainted before, that he is an *Eunomian*? And it has likewise been shewn Mr. *Whiston* before, that the *Eunomian Creed* distinguished itself by declaring, "that the Son is absolutely *Unlike* to God " the Father, who neither communicated his " own Essence or Substance to him, nor begot " him according to it. 'Tis evident therefore that according to the *Eunomean Confession* of

*Ibid. p. 46.**Hist. Pref. p. 63.**Second Rep. p. 35. Ref. p. 15.*

Faith, subscribed to by Mr. *Whiston*, the Son is of *another* Essence or Substance from the Father; and that consequently Mr. *Whiston* has incurred the *Nicene* Anathema, notwithstanding all his artful Evasions. And it is not my Business here to push this Matter any farther than the *Nicene Anathema*; but I very willingly leave the *Connection* between that *Anathema* and *legal Heresy* to the consideration of Mr. *Whiston's* Superiours.

*Preced.
of Convoc.
p. 45, 46.*

Ibid.

*Vid Euseb.
Epist. apud
Socrat. l. i.
c. 8.*

As to the other part of Mr. *Whiston's* strange Assertion, namely, that he has not fully affirmed that our Saviour was made or Created in that Sense wherein the Council of Nice condemned that Proposition, he appeals to Alexander (Bishop of Alexandria)'s Circular Letter, and Eusebius's Letter to his Diocese, to determine in what Sense the words Create and Creature were rejected by it; namely, that they were rejected upon a supposition that the Followers of *Arius* used those words, in the very same Sense, of the Son of God and of inferiour Creatures. Now, not to insist upon the absurdity of Mr. *Whiston's* quoting the Circular Letter of Alexander, which was wrote before the *Nicene* Council, to determine in what Sense the words Create and Creature were Condemned by the subsequent Council of Nice, nor to dwell upon the Sophistry of Eusebius (in his forementioned Letter) in order to escape the *Nicene Anathema*, by that notable Distinction between immediate and mediate Creation by God the Father, namely,

namely, that the former is peculiar to the Son of God, and the latter belongs in common to the rest of the Creation wrought by the Son, as the *Mediate* instrument of God the Father; I say, to pass by these weak and precarious Authorities, 'tis very evident, there is no Foundation for any such Distinction in the *Nicene* Creed, either in the Body of it, or the annex'd Anathema; and that in both the words *ποιηθέντα* and *κτιστὸν*, *Made* and *Created*, are used at large, and in their general and plain acceptation. Nor indeed is at all material, whether God the Father *Created* his Son *immediately*, and the rest of the World *mediately* by him; since as both are ultimately supposed to be produced by the sole Power of the All-mighty Father, they are supposed to be equally *Creatures*, and equally *his* *Creatures*, in the *last resort*. For whether that Power be consider'd as communicated or not, does not alter the Case, since it is God the Father's Power that Acts upon each Supposition. And if so, *Eusebius's* and *Mr. Whiston's* Distinction of *Creatures* is weak and trifling, tho' used by both on the same occasion, namely, to ward off the *Nicene* Anathema.

I will only add on this occasion one Remark on the other Reason offer'd by *Mr. Whiston* to shew, that *the Council of Nice* did not mean to Deny that *Christ* was *Created* by God, namely, that *Athanasius* and the rest of

*Proc. of
Conv. p. 47.*

Prov. c. 8.
v. 22.

of the Church antiently applied the known Words of Solomon, ἐκτίσας με, &c. *He created me*, to the *Logos*, the *living Wisdom* of God. To which I shall briefly Reply, that, without disputing at present with what propriety this Expression was applied to our Saviour; the *Septuagint-Version* must be here allow'd not to be agreeable to the *Hebrew Text*, if we may depend not only on the most eminent *Hebrew Criticks* among the *Moderns*, (whose Judgment no doubt will be despised by Mr. *Whiston*) but on the *Ancient Greek Translations* of *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, and *Theodotion*, who Concurred in rendring that Passage by ἐκτίσας, *possessed*, as *We* do at present. That is, in St. *John's* Phrase, *in the Beginning the Word was with God*. And therefore since there is so small a Difference between the Word now in the *Septuagint* ἐκτίσας and ἐκτίσας, or rather ἐκτίσας, it is highly probable that this little Variation was made very early in Transcribing the *Septuagint*; as the Learned Dr. *Grabe* has shewn several others were before the Age of *Origen*, and so before the Council of *Nice*. And Mr. *Whiston* knows very well how few of the *Fathers* were capable of recurring to the Original *Hebrew Text*, and indeed how almost all of them in fact acquiesced in the Translation of the *Septuagint*, corrupt as it was at that time.

Having thus shewn the Weakness of Mr. *Whiston's* Objections against the true and genuine

Vid. Cl.
Grabe
Dissert. de
vitiis.
LXX. In;
interpretum,
Oxon.
1710.

genuine meaning of the Word *κλιστον*, *Cred-*
ted, as Anathematiz'd by the Council of
Nice, I shall not here enter into a professed
 Vindication of *any unguarded Expressions* of
particular Fathers before the Council of *Nice*, ^{Proc. of}
 since it is not only foreign to my present ^{Conv. p. 47.}
 Design, but because it has been already
 proved in *Bishop Bull's* elaborate Work, that
 the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers us'd those harsher
 Expressions in an Orthodox Sense; and be-
 cause upon the Publication of Mr. *Whiston's*
Collection of *Primitive Testimonies*, that
 Matter will, no doubt, be again placed in
 a clear irresistible Light.

And upon my return to Mr. *Whiston's*
Reply to the Reflector, from which I have
 willingly Deviated in Vindication of the
 Superiour *Authority* and avow'd *Sense* of the
 Council of *Nice* from Mr. *Whiston's* latest ^{Second Reps}
 Objections, I think my self oblig'd to take ^{to Dr. Alls}
 notice of what he is pleas'd to add about the ^{p. 36, 37.}
Apostolical Constitutions.

He has thought fit to insinuate, that the
 best part of what the *Reflector* has said
 about the *Constitutions* is taken from Dr. ^{Ibid.}
Allix. The *Reflector*, indeed, found him-
 self oblig'd to repeat that Learned Writer's ^{Ref. p. 20.}
 Argument against them, in order to shew
 the Weakness of Mr. *Whiston's* Answer to
 his Objection. But can Mr. *Whiston* be so
 Unjust as to assert, that the *Reflector* has ^{Ibid. p. 21,}
 not Pushed that Matter farther? Has he not ^{22, 23.}
 parti-

particularly reply'd to Mr. *Whiston's* Answer, and shewn the insufficiency of it; not from Dr. *Allix*, but *Epiphanius* himself, from the former of whom, however, that Author will ever be ready to learn? But it is certainly much easier to pass over whole Pages untouch'd, and with a Supercilious Silence, than to Answer the Authority of *Epiphanius*, that is really *against* the *Constitutions*, tho' appealed to in their favour by Mr. *Whiston*; or to Determine plainly, in what Sense, either of better Testimonies, or of a higher Degree of Inspiration, the *Constitutions* are stiled by Mr. *Whiston*, the *most Sacred* Part of the Holy Scripture. Mr. *Whiston* has therefore, here offended against the first and great Rule of Controversy, by neglecting to *Define* Ambiguous Words. And, upon *this* Occasion, I will desire the Favour of him to recollect what he once acknowledg'd upon *another*, namely, that *studied Evasions* are but too often made to pass for Answers to the shrewdest

See Vind.
of his Theo-
ry p. 2. Objections.

Second Rep.
p. 36, 37.

Mr. *Whiston* has here added nothing New about the *Constitutions* but his assertion that he does not depend upon mere guesses for the Correction of the *Doxologies* contained in them. But till he has produced some other Authorities than Conjectures, he has no reason to be Angry with those that can meet with no other in the Books he has yet Published; from which

which alone, and not from his Uncommunicated MS. Papers, his Adversaries pretend to argue against him. When Mr. *Whiston* shall have Published his Treatise on the *Constitutions*, it will be time enough to consider his particular Authorities, and whether they are strong enough to support the Weight of so Uncommon a Confidence. And, indeed, a Speedy Publication of them were to be wished for, if there were the least foundation for Mr.

W's Sanguine Assertion, that the Original sacred Books of Christianity that he has Discover'd, See Proc. of Convoc. p. 51. are sufficient to put a mighty stop, if not a final end, to all our Disputes, and all our Disorders, and all our Divisions, and all our Impieties also.

I pray God, they may not produce a quite Contrary Effect ! In the mean time I am

very glad to find, that Mr. *Whiston* after all his fluctuations of Thought and Variety of Sentiments, here acknowledged by himself, is at last fixed in his Opinion of the Sacredness of Second Reply p. 37. the *Constitutions* ; Since as Arch-Bishop *Tillotson* said of Transubstantiation with regard

to Popery, the stress that is laid on the most Sacred Authority of the *Constitutions* will be a Mill-stone about the Neck of Mr. *Whiston's* Cause, and sink it for ever. And the amazing height to which Mr. *Whiston* has lately

raised their Authority, is a Confirmation of See Proc. of Convoc. p. 103. my Opinion ; for he now owns publicly, what cannot be repeated without indignation by every good Christian, that he takes

Ibid

the Constitutions, in their account of our Saviours Passion, to be more Authentick and Exact than the four Gospels themselves, and that the present Copies of the Gospels are rather to be Corrected by them than the Contrary. Good God! How boundless a thing is Error! Whither will not the Violence of Prejudices and an irregular imagination transport Men that have once deviated from the right way! Let Mr. Whiston look back upon his former Self, and Consider from whence he is fallen! Would it not a few Years ago have shocked him, and sounded somewhat like Prophaness and Libertinism it self, that the four Original Gospels ought to be Corrected, in so important a Point as that of our Saviours Passion, by the accounts of a Book that is considered by the Christian Church as of an Uncertain Original and Dubious Credit; as well as acknowledged by Mr. Whiston himself to be Corrupt. ed in many places, to have several interpolations, and whose Original Readings are even yet to be Restored! This is so very Extravagant and absurd, that on this occasion it is impossible to forbear thinking on Hazael's Expression of a Astonishment, *Is thy servant a Dog that he should do this great thing?* But Tully understood humane Nature very well, when he made so good a Judgment as that, *Qui semul Verecundia fines transierit, eum bene & naviter oportet esse impudentem.* Words, of too much energy, as well as too pertinent

Hist. Pref.
p. 47. 48.

2 Kin. c.
8. v. 13.

Cic. Epist.
ad Luc. l.
5.

pertinent, to be put into *English*. But this naturally leads me to the consideration of what Mr. *Whiston* offers about his *Harmony of the Gospels*, upon which the *Reflector* had Animadverted.

That Writer, with his usual freedom, had accused Mr. *Whiston* of Mangling St. Matthew's Gospel, and introducing Confusion into all the rest under the notion of Harmonizing them; and added, that for several Errors of that kind Mr. *Whiston* had been justly Chastised by a Venerable Prelate, with whom he had formerly the honour of Corresponding. To which Mr. *Whiston* Replies, that this Charge is very Unfair, and utterly groundless, and that his Lordship had never imputed any Crime of that nature to him. Let us therefore Exa-

Ref. p. 24.

*Second Rep.
to Dr. Al.
p. 38.*

mine this Matter a little farther. Has not Mr. *Whiston* in point of Fact maintained, that the first Thirteen Chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel (that is, near half that Gospel,) are Dislocated, placed wrong, and in a state of the greatest Confusion? Is not this Paradox likewise supported by a few fantastical Reasons of his own, without once pretending to recur to any antient MSS. of the Original Gospels, or the earliest Translations of them, to favour his Pretensions? Has he not also actually thrown into the greatest Disorder the whole History of our Saviour's Passion and Death, in all the four Gospels? And can Mr. *Whiston* Deny, that the most Learned

*See Harmony of the
Gospels, p.
100. &c.*

*Ibid. p.
188. 191.
&c.*

Bishop of Worcester has *Chastised* him for the liberties he has used on that occasion? Mr. *Whiston* may, if he pleases, Deny all this; but I shall still take the liberty to affirm, that as every one, by perusal of Mr. *Whiston's Harmony*, may satisfy himself of the truth of the first part of the Charge against Mr. *Whiston*, namely, his throwing so great a part of *St. Matthew's Gospel*, and the History of *the Passion* and *Death* of our Lord in all the four Gospels, into great and unaccountable Disorder; so I have seen some Unpublished Papers, sent by the fore-mentioned Prelate to Mr. *Whiston* that Reflect very highly upon his Errors about the *last Passover* and *Death* of Christ, in his *Harmony* of the *Gospels*, and particularly that *pernicious* one of placing the Death of Christ on a different Day from that of the true Jewish Passover. For which last Correction I have also an Unexceptionable Testimony, namely, that of Mr. *Whiston* himself. That learned Bishop very justly thinks it a matter of no small Consequence, that Christ, the true Paschal Lamb, be believ'd to Die on the undoubted Day of the Jewish Passover, namely, the 14th of *Nisan*; whereas Mr. *Whiston* pretends that he was Crucify'd on the 15th. An Error, therefore, stiled *pernicious*, since it affects the Sacrifice of Christ for the Sins of the World, as it put an end to the *Legal* Sacrifices at a certain Period fixed by Ancient Prophecy.

And

See Hist.
Pref. p. 43.

Ibid.

And that my Lord of *Worcester* Corrected many of Mr. *Whiston's* Errors of this kind, I have a Demonstration now lying before me; I mean, his Lordship's own *Harmony of the Gospels*, from *March 28th* to *April 5th A. D. 33.* together with Mr. *Whiston's* Mistakes in the Chronology of that Period put down in another Column by his Lordship, and at the same time *Confuted* by him. And it is to be hop'd, that the most Learned Bishop will sometime or other communicate to the Publick, not only *this very Harmony* of the History of the *Passion* and *Death* of our Lord, wrote in direct opposition to Mr. *Whiston's* *Dislocations*, but likewise what he has prepar'd upon the whole History of the *Life* of our Blessed Saviour, Recorded in all the Four Gospels. The World will always acquiesce, with the profoundest Reverence, in the Judgment of that Illustrious Chronologer; but Men are not yet convinced, that Mr. *Whiston* has Abilities or Authority enough to Model the *Old* Gospels as he pleases, or to impose a *New* one upon the Christian Church. Mr. *Whiston* has, indeed, made use of a very proper Word, when he expressed his supposed Disorders of the Evangelists by the Name of *Dislocations*; since they as much weaken and deform the Body of Evangelical History, as *Dislocations* do the Body Natural. Other Examiners of the sacred History have allow'd

*Second Rep.
to Dr. All.
p. 38.*

of

of a few Transpositions and Variations, occasion'd by the Negligence and Mistakes of Transcribers; but Mr. *Whiston's Dislocations* affect the Evangelical History, in its most important Parts, and deprive it even of that Common Providence which (according to him,) has exerted it self *more effectually* in its Care and Preservation of *Prophane* Authors. The Vehemence of Mr. *Whiston's* Temper has, no doubt, transported him beyond the proper use of the several *Hints*, both in *Divinity* and *Philosophy*, that he has received from *two* Great and Learned Men; on which his Works have been chiefly founded, excepting what he has *Transcrib'd* from Mr. *Mede*. But the Abuse of those *Hints* is by no means to be imputed to the Charitable Authors of them. The gross Defects of his Explication of the Deluge by a Comet are no more guarded by the Authority of, than they are an Aspersion upon, the great Promoter of the *Cometical* Astronomy; since Mr. *Whiston's* Errors arise either from a Misapplication of the best and truest System of Philosophy, or are false Inferences from it. So likewise it by no means follows, that because some Errors have gradually crept into several *Numbers* in some parts of the History of the Old Testament, or that we meet with Transpositions of a few Passages in the antient Prophets, therefore such monstrous Dislocations of the Evangelical History are to be

be admitted as Mr. *Whiston's* fruitful Imagination has advanced. If the Gospels have been treated with such gross Negligence from the very beginning of Christianity, and their Mutual Repugnances in order of Time are now to be reconciled by the mere Fancy of *Men*, without any regard to antient Authorities, Scepticism no doubt will be favour'd with a more plausible Plea than ever, and the Reverence due to the Sacred Text, thus rendred precarious, will suffer no little Diminution.

And upon this occasion I cannot but observe how Mr. *Whiston* and other Compilers of *Harmonies* run into Extreams. 'Tis evident, that most of our Lord's Discourses that are recorded in the Gospels were *Occasional*; and therefore it is not improbable that many of them were *wrote* in no exact Method, but in the same *Occasional* way as they were first *Delivered*. And as for several of the Notations of Time expressed in them, such as the words *then*, *after those Days*, and the like, it appears upon a Collation of many Passages, that those Expressions were used with great *latitude*. There is 'tis true, a *Resemblance* between the the Doctrines and Miracles of our Saviour at very different Times and Places; but there is no occasion for reducing the corresponding Doctrines and Miracles to the same Time and Place, after the Method of Modern *Harmonies*, since our Lord must
be

be supposed to have the *same* sett of Doctrines to deliver occasionally, and to perform Miracles (in confirmation of his Messiahship) which tho' wrought at different Times and Places as occasion was given, may appear extremely like to one another. But Mr. *Whiston* has carried this point too far. Upon a mistaken supposition of the *order* of Time being always observed with the greatest ex-

See *Harm.*
of the *Gosp.*
p. 124.

127, 130,
131, &c.

actness by the Evangelists, he found himself obliged to make almost every thing *Double* in the Gospels. He has therefore maintain'd, that there were *two Distinct Descents of the Holy Ghost, two Ministries of Christ, namely, a private and a publick one, two different Callings of the same Apostles, two drivings of the Traders out of the Temple, two deliveries of the Lord's Prayer, and almost every thing else, excepting the Prophecies* cited in the Gospels, which (to the utter destruction of all *Types*) he has endeavour'd to reduce to a *single* Sense. This is a method of *Harmonizing* that seems highly preposterous and unnatural; tho' Mr. *Whiston* has thought it necessary, in order to avoid a little irregularity in the Relation, or rather a Variety of Circumstances in different Writers, who may fairly be presumed to Choose some and Omit others.

See *Boyl's*
Lett. p. 13,
14, &c.

But I shall add no more on this occasion, since Mr. *Whiston* will allow no body the *Privilege of Examining* any thing but *himself*; he having formed so contemptible a notion

Second

Rep. to D.
All. p. 38.

on of the *implicite* Faith of his Adversaries, as in comparison of them even to Caress the *Deists* themselves, whom he has Celebrated as Men of *great Probity*; a Character he has thought fit to Deny to those profess'd *Divines* that have opposed the Progress of his ill Opinions. But as the *Reflector on his Conduct* has had a large share of petulant and reproachfull language bestow'd upon him, so is he very well pleased with suffering in so much good Company as *both Houses of Convocation*, who are by Mr. *Whiston* accused of *Ignorance* even in the History of *General Councils*; and as Men that have *rejected* true *Christianity*, both Bishops and Presbyters are Cited to the *Judgment-Seat* of Christ. However, to shew Mr. *Whiston* that Others have Studied the *Harmony* of the Holy Scriptures as well as himself, I will for once Assume so far as to be *his* Instructor; I mean, I will take the liberty to refer him to the best Compiler yet extant of the *Harmony* of the *Gospels*; the learned Monsieur *Toynard*; who, tho' he published his elaborate *Harmony* of the *Gospels* at *Paris* in 1707, as the result of many Years severe Study, is not taken notice of by Mr. *W.* in his very Defective *Catalogue* of a Theological Library published in 1709, and must therefore be presumed to be Unknown to him. I do not pretend to say that *Toynard* has, after all his learned labour, carried that Work to absolute perfection, nei-

G

ther

See Proc.
of Convoc.
p. 59.

Ibid.
p. 39. 40,
&c.

Second
Reply to
Dr. Allix,
p. 2. 3.
&c.

Proc. of
Convoc. p.
35, 36, 60,
61, &c.

Ibid.
p. 52, 53.

See Second
Rep. to Dr.
Allix. p.
38.

Ibid.

ther will I excuse any mistakes that may possibly occur in it; but that Author will certainly set Mr. *Whiston* right in several respects, and particularly as to the time of the *Passion* and *Death* of our Blessed Saviour, of which, with reference to Mr. *Whiston*, we have treated before. So that notwithstanding Mr. *Whiston's* injurious Treatment of *Divines*, and the approbation he has given to an *Atheistical* reflection upon that Order, as contra-distinguished from *Philosophers*, and as Men that only *believe* without Examination, I doubt not but the World will readily agree with Mr. *Whiston* that he cannot be properly ranked under either Denomination; since he is no more a just Examiner than a true Believer. And therefore in answer to all those Rudenesses he has here or elsewhere vented upon his *Superiours*, as well as *my self*, who only pretend to be his *Equal*, except in the goodness of my *Cause*, I shall, by way of *Caution*, insinuate to him, that *Pride* has been equally the Original of *Madness* and of *Heresy* in all Ages.

Ibid.
p 39.

But to go on in Mr. *Whiston's Animadversions*, I shall here only take notice of his *Evasion* of the Charge of a gross *Contradiction* in Chronology. He had formerly placed the *Apostolical Canons* at the end of the second Century; and yet asserted that the *Apocalypse*, written A. D. 96. was wrote after the 85th of those Canons. Now, by what

Art

Art does Mr. *Whiston* avoid the imputation of a *Contradiction*? Why, truly, by raising a Mist before his Reader's Eyes, by the benefit of which he hopes to escape. He acknowledges that every one that compares things as they here barely lie before him, must readily suppose that he is truly guilty of a gross *Contradiction*: But that in reality it is not so. And the Reason he offers is, because he knew from certain Characters in that 85th Canon, that it was made by the Apostles themselves, before the writing of the *Apocalypse*. Here, I confess, I am at a loss to Determine, whether this Answer be more insincere than weak and superficial. For it really amounts to this, that tho' he assigned the end of the Second Century to the Apostolical Canons in his Writings Cited on this occasion, yet he knew all the while in his own Mind that one of those Canons, namely the 85th was made by the Apostles before the end of the First Century, and before the *Apocalypse* it self was Wrote. That is, Mr. *Whiston* Wrote one thing in his Book, and believed at the same time himself what was Contradictory to it. But if he thinks fit to escape a *Contradiction* at the expence of his Sincerity, I shall not think fit to pursue him.

Second
Rep. to Dr.
Allix, p.

39.

Ibid.

In the next Paragraph Mr. *Whiston* makes such plentiful Concessions of his own ill breeding in Publishing private Conversations

Second
Rep. p. 32
& 40.

tions and Letters *without leave first obtained*, that nothing remains for me to Reply to on that Article, but what he has insinuated about his *Conversation* with Dr. Grabe on the Subject of the *Apostolical Constitutions*.

Ibid.

These are the Words of the Meek and Charitable Mr. *Whiston*: Nor shall I at all Value his intimation, that Dr. Grabe's Account of the fore-mention'd Conference contradicts mine, till I see it under Dr. Grabe's Hand. He is too honest a Man to say so. But these are Words too significant to be Dismissed without a stricture upon them. As I am much oblig'd to Mr. *Whiston* for an Opinion of me that I am not Conscious of Deserving, so am I very well pleased that I have an Opportunity of Vindicating my Self from the Malice of his Insinuation. I had reflected on Mr. *Whiston*'s Sincerity, in misrepresenting Dr. Grabe's Conversation with him about the *Constitutions*, as contrary to Mr. *Wilkins*'s Account of the same, as well as what Dr. Grabe has himself given upon all Occasions. Mr. *Wilkins*'s Account is published by Mr. *Whiston*: And it is now likewise under the Hand of Dr. Grabe himself, that Mr. *Whiston* has misrepresented his Sense of the *Constitutions*, as deliver'd in that Conversation. I shall therefore here Transcribe so very important a Passage as the following one, from a late Treatise to which Dr. Grabe has prefixed his Name.

After

Ref. B. p.
38, & 39.

See Hist.
Pref. p.
52.
See Dr.
Grabes
Essay on
Arab.
MSS.
Oxon,
1711.

After that Learned Gentleman has assured the *Ibid.* p. 26
World in all sincerity, that he has not alter'd his & 27.

Sentiments about the Clementine Constitutions,
which were different from those of Mr. Whi-
ston Thirteen Years ago; i. e. when he pub-
lish'd his Spicilegium; and that he does still
firmly retain, and will, God willing, maintain

the same; I say, after this, and more to
 the same purpose, Dr. Grabe has been plea-
 sed to add *these* memorable Words: " This
 " Declaration I am forced to make here
 " publickly, because Mr. *Whiston* has not
 " only by private Narratives, but moreover
 " by a printed Account of our private Con-
 " versation on *Michaelmas*, Anno. 1709. in
 " his Historical Preface, p. 53. Seqq. gi-
 " ven great occasion to several People,
 " whom I do not converse with, to think,
 " that I have since changed my Mind, and
 " am come, if not quite over, yet very
 " near to His Sentiments about the said
 " Constitutions. Now as this is utterly
 " false, so I could distinctly shew, how
 " Mr. *Whiston* has strangely mistaken and
 " misrepresented what I have spoken with
 " him in the aforesaid Conversation. But
 " that is not my present Business; I re-
 " serve this to the Preface of my Essay upon
 " the often mention'd *Clementine Constituti-*
 " *ons*. Thus as the worthy Doctor has done

Ibid.

Publick Justice both to himself, Mr. *Wil-* See also D.
kins, and *Me*; so, no doubt, he will make Grabe's
 his 35, &c. *Essay*, at p.

his Promise good, if God gives him Life and Health, and will attack the Sacred Authority of the *Constitutions* with the same success he has very lately the *Arabick Doctrine of the Apostles*. In which attempt, as he has entirely overthrown the very foundation of its Authority as laid by Mr. *Whiston*, so has he sufficiently exposed Mr. *Whiston* for daring to put so shameful an Imposture upon the Learned World, and establish the *Sacredness* of a Book he had never once perused himself, or had interpreted to him, and therefore did not discover was *verbatim* the very same with the greater part of the *Clementine Constitutions*. Such a Mortification as this, if duly improved, is certainly sufficient to teach Mr. *Whiston* himself a little *Humility*.

See likewise Mr. *Whiston's* Remarks on Dr. *Grabe's* Essay. passim.

See *Ref.* p. 30, & 31.

See *Second Rep.* to Dr. *All.* p. 41.

Ibid.

The *Reflector* on Mr. *Whiston* had likewise charged him, upon such Authorities as are ready to be exhibited on all proper Occasions, with several *Shuffles* in *Conversation*; one of which he has not ventured to Deny, tho' he speaks with ambiguity enough about it in his late *Answer*. The Charge was, that to avoid the Eternity of the Son of God, he denied there are any Expressions in Scripture that ascribe Eternity to God the Father; since the same Expressions are applied to both. Upon this he freely owns, that he believes the usual Language of Scripture, *ὁ θεὸς αἰῶνος εἰς αἰῶνα*, or *πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων*, and *εἰς τὴν αἰῶνα τῶν αἰώνων*, with the like, does not imply

a *Scholastick Eternity*. But who ever affirmed it did? Does not the *Reflector*, in particular, assert in express words, that "the same Phrases, founded on the Jewish Notion of Eternity, are applied in common to both, i. e. God the Father and the Son." *See Refl. on Mr. W. p. 31.*

With what Face therefore dares Mr. *Whiston* here to Confound two things so very different, and so plainly distinguished by the *Reflector*; namely, the *Scholastick* and *Jewish* Notions of Eternity? I not only then Distinguished them by insisting only on the *Jewish* Notion, but I will now Present Mr. *Whiston* with the Reason of that Distinction, to shew that the Son of God is declared, by the forementioned Sacred Dialect, to be Co-eternal with his Father. And it is this. That the *Jewish* Notion of Eternity is that of Unphilosophical Men, who in the Infancy of Learning went back no farther in the consideration of Eternity, than as a Being had Duration before the Visible Scene of things appeared, and so before all Ages, without troubling their Heads with nice Refinements on Eternity *a parte ante*, and *a parte post*; in the *Scholastick* Style. This will appear to be the Original of those Phrases, as implying Eternity, to all those that have used Mr. *Lock*'s Method of tracing their first Ideas, and reflecting on the additions made gradually to them. But I do not fully comprehend what Mr. *Whiston* means by asserting, that

Sec. Rep.
p. 41.

Ibid.

Sec. Rep.
p. 41. &
p. 33.

Ref. p. 31.

Sec. Rep.
p. 41.

that there will be no great harm in extending those Phrases farther in the Case of the Supreme God; for if those Phrases are used about the Existence of God in Holy Scripture, as they evidently are, they must necessarily be used in a farther Sense with relation to him, than what Mr. Whiston says they properly denote, namely, from the beginning of the World to its final Conclusion, and no more. And when he softly insinuates that there will be no great harm in extending those Phrases farther in the Case of God, by the ambiguity of the Expression, I fear, Mr. W. betrays something worse than mere Ignorance of the Primitive Dialect.

With regard to what follows here about Ignatius's Epistles, as well as what he mention'd before about his last Enquiries, it is superfluous to say any thing more till Mr. Whiston's larger Dissertation on them is Published, to give some Spirit to his jejune imperfect Essay; except that he has on this Occasion quoted the Reflector falsely, who thus expressed himself, "That Citations of the lesser Epistles of Ignatius have been shewn to be made by several antient Fathers, and slighted by Mr. Whiston as alter'd and abridged; whereas Mr. Whiston in repeating this from the Reflector has had the boldness to Substitute the words, later writers, in the room of the Reflector's antient Fathers. Whatever affected ignorance of my meaning he may here pretend to, I think

think I fully understand *his* meaning on this occasion. But I willingly suspend all farther Enquiry into that Matter at present, since Mr. *Whiston* is so very Sanguine as to promise the world, *that if he is not able to determine that Dispute, he will not often pretend to do it in any parallel Case whatsoever.* And this may possibly happen to promote the peace and quiet of the World, to which I would gladly Contribute upon all occasions. I suspect, however, the Event; since I recollect that Mr. *Whiston* in a parallel Case, namely, his Discovery of the *Doctrine of the Apostles* in the *Arabick MSS.* at Oxford, of which Dr. *Grabe* has given so good an account in his late *Essay*, has used these very words, that he has thereby put an end to that Dispute for ever.

But to draw towards a Conclusion of this *Vindication*; the *Reflector* had animadverted on Mr. *Whiston* for his judicious Choice of Mr. *Emlin*, the famous Socinian Preacher, formerly Condemned for Blasphemy in Ireland, to be his Agent, and carry his Decent Message to the *Prolocutor*. Upon which Mr. *Whiston* shews so little Command of his Passion, as to summon me to the great Tribunal for this supposed Calumny on his Friend Mr. *Emlin*, who, he says, to his knowledge is no Socinian; nor does he believe that he ever was one. And he adds, that I assert this great Untruth from common Fame, the more securely to impute Blasphemy to him. 'Tis surprizing that a Person of Mr.

H

Whiston's

Hist. Pref.
p. 119.Ref. on
Mr. W.
p. 31. 32.Second Rep.
to Dr. All.
p. 42.

Eph. c. 4.
v. 31.

Whiston's Character could write all this either so Negligently, or so Uncharitably, whilst he appeals to the *Day of Judgment*, and within a Page of his own Citation of *St. Paul's* Advice to put away all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil-speaking, with all malice, as a proper Prescription for those that deal in Controversy : since I shall soon make it appear plain to all the World, that I had reason to style *Mr. Emlin* a *Socinian*, and to assert that he was Condemned for *Blasphemy* in *Ireland*. And if so, I shall leave the Reader to Determine what respect is due to the most Solemn Appeals of *Mr. Whiston*. I confess I am no great Friend to Appeals from the merits of the present Dispute to the *Day of Judgment* ; which being remote and future, is by no means now Decisive of the Point in question. But under all the awe and reverence that are due to that great Tribunal, before which *Mr. Whiston* and I must equally appear, I shall now offer some Reasons for my fore-mention'd Assertions about *Mr. Emlin* ; to whose Person as I am entirely a stranger, and bear not the least ill-will, so have I been not Unconversant in his writings, as the Extract of them, necessary to be subjoined in my own *Vindication*, will fully evince. I do not pretend to know of what Opinion *Mr. Emlin* is at present, neither is it to my purpose to Enquire whether he has changed his Scheme or not ;

not ; but the Reasons that induce me to believe he was formerly (at least) a Socinian, are these that follow. 1st. That I have actually seen it under the hand of the late Bishop Williams, no incompetent Judge of Socinianism, that Mr. Emlin the Author of the Book, entituled *Humble Enquiry*, &c. was Assistant to Mr. Boyse a Non-Conformist in Dublin, who taking occasion to Preach about the Exaltation of our Saviour, advanced a Socinian Principle ; of which being accused he went for England, but returning at the desire of some, gave this account (i. e. in *Humble Enquiry*) of his Principles in Print. For which he was Sentenced to suffer for Blasphemy, &c. There is no occasion for Transcribing the rest ; and therefore I proceed, in the next place, to shew from Mr. Emlin's *Humble Enquiry* into the Scripture-account of Jesus Christ, his Vindication of it, and some other Papers said to be his, that there is great reason to give him the Denomination of a Socinian ; and that he was a Preacher both at Dublin and London is too notorious to want a Proof, and above all, is particularly Confessed by Mr. Whiston himself. My Authorities are these. At P. 4. C. 1. of Mr. Emlin's *Humble Enquiry*, he expresses himself thus. — “ I shall allow that only in his human Nature Christ could give up his Kingdom ; but then 'tis, because 'tis as *Man delegated* and *Inhabited by God*, that he sways and ma-

Ref. on Mr. Whi. p. 31. Pros. of Convoc. p. 33. & 56. See Humble Enquiry into Scripture account of J. C. printed 1702, in 4^{to}. p. 4. C. 1.

H 2

“ nages

“ nages this Kingdom; and if this be al-
 “ low’d, (as I think it needs must) that the
 “ *Man* Christ is sufficient *by help from God*
 “ to manage his Universal Spiritual King-
 “ dom, I see no Reason there will be to op-
 “ pose those *Unitarians*, &c.

Ib. p. 5.
c. 1.

“ Our Adversaries will gain nothing by
 “ alledging Texts to prove the Title of God
 “ to be given to Christ, since that may be,
 “ and yet it will not prove him to be the
 “ Supreme independent God, but only one
 “ who is *Inhabited* of, and *Commissioned* and
 “ *Enabled by him who is so*.

Ib. p. 6.
c. 1.

“ By *John* 14. 10. ’tis evident there was
 “ no Agent *in* and *with* him (*i. e.* Christ)
 “ but the *Father*. He only has Power in
 “ himself, and needs no Assistance.

Ib. p. 14.
c. 1.

“ Christ’s Kingly Office by which he rules
 “ the Church undeniably proves this large
 “ Knowledg (*i. e.* Universal Knowledg of
 “ the Hearts and ways of Men, *pag*, 13.) to
 “ be exercised by him *as Man*, however he
 gains it.”

Ibid.

“ This Office and Power must then be
 “ given to the *Man*, or humane Nature *on-*
 “ *ly*; and as *Man* we cannot deny him to
 “ be suitably qualify’d for it.”

Ib. p. 17.
c. 2.

Mr. E’s Answer about the Mediation of
 Christ is, “ If the *Man*, or humane Nature
 “ *alone*, be capable of doing the part of a
 “ Mediator, then ’tis not necessary that Je-
 “ sus Christ should be *more than a Man, in-*
 “ *habited,*

“ *habited* by, and *related* to God, in order
 “ to that Office.”

“ Our Mediator, according to St. Paul, *ib. p. 18.*
 “ 1 *Tim. 2. 5*, was *only a Man*, who also is ^{c. 1.}
 “ by Office a God, or Ruler over all.”

By this long Induction it appears that Mr. *Emlin's* fixed Opinion in the very *Book* for which he *Suffer'd* was, that Jesus was a mere *Man*, inhabited, assisted, and acted by the Supreme God; which must necessarily be own'd to be the great fundamental Principle of *Socinianism*. This Notion is spread throughout all his *Book*, excepting a single Passage or two that have somewhat of an *Arian* Aspect, but are express'd so *Dubiously* as by no means to ballance this large *Socinian* Collection. I am, God be thanked, above dissembling any thing that is in the least favourable to my Adversary, and therefore refer my Reader to *See Humb. Enquiry, p. 2. & p. 21.* the connexion of those very Passages. Of which, *viz. Tho' it should seem, and tho it be allow'd,* his Learned Adversary, Mr. *Boyse*, says very justly, “ That he is sorry Mr. *E.* “ speaks so very *doubtfully* of our Blessed Saviour's *pre-existent* Nature, least, as he supposes, Mr. *E.* should Disoblige his *Socinian* Friends. Mr. *B.* likewise well observes, “ That Mr. *E.* has probably omitted “ the Consideration of *Eternity*, in speaking “ of the Divine Perfections as belonging to “ Christ, out of willingness to avoid the “ Controversy between the *Arians* and So-
 “ *cinians*

*Vindic. of
 the Deity
 of J. C.
 Dublin,
 1703. in
 4to. p. 27,
 & 47.*

“ *cinians* about the *pre-existent* Nature of
“ Christ.

Published
in 4to.
1705. p.
12. c. 1.

But to go on to a farther View of Mr. Emlin's Opinion in his *Other Tracts*. In his *Vindication of the Worship of the Lord Jesus*, in Answer to Mr. Boyse, he writes thus. “ Mr. B. cannot say (as we may) that the hu-
“ *mane* Nature acts alone, in this Mediation with the Divine.

Ib. p. 28.
c. 2.

“ If the *Trinitarians* could worship the
“ *Humanity* because it related to the *Divin-*
“ *ty*, why may not *Others* also worship a
“ *Man inhabited* by it, tho' not by *Personal*
“ *Union*? And it is observable, that *this* is
the very Book Mr. *Whiston* boasts of as *Un-*
answerable, and on that occasion asserts, *That*
not one proper part of the Socinian Doctrine can
be charged upon Mr. Emlin. The *truth* of
which Assertion I leave to the Reader's Me-
ditation.

See Proc.
of Convoc.
p. 33.

Thus likewise in a Print * that States the
Difference between Mr. Emlin and the *Dissent-*
ing Ministers of Dublin; as well as in the
† *Brief Account of the Prosecution and Impri-*
sonment of Mr. E. Mr. Emlin is said to have
agreed with those Ministers in believing,
“ That the infinite God is present in the
“ *Man* Christ Jesus, and actuates him by per-
“ *petual Influence*; but that they disagree'd
“ about the *Personal Union* of God and the
“ *Man*

* Published in 4to. 1703. † In 4to. (probably) in 1704.

“ *Man* Christ Jesus; the denial of which is
 “ (in the former) insinuated to have been ex-
 “ torted from him; and (in the latter) it is
 “ said, that Mr. *Emlin* declar’d his Judgment
 “ to them, that God and the *Man* Christ Je-
 “ sus were not truly the same Person. ”

And indeed it is very Remarkable that in
 neither of these Tracts, of which Mr.
Emlin is the supposed Author, nor in Mr.
E’s foremention’d *Vindication of the Lord*
Jesus, is there any supposition made of
 the *Pre-existence* of any Principle in Jesus
 Christ, or of a Created *Logos* residing in him.

So that, I think, I may now be allow’d,
 from an enumeration of so many Particu-
 lars, to infer, as the result of the whole,
 that Mr. *Emlin* (whatever *secret* Opinion
 he may entertain in his own Breast, and with
 an Exception of a *Dubious* Passage or two
 in his *Humble Enquiry* before accounted for)

has made use of no other Hypothesis but
 the common *Socinian* one, namely, “ That
 “ God did *inhabit* in the Person of the
 “ Lord Christ, by an extraordinary Pre-
 “ sence, and exertion of his Power in him,
 “ incomparably greater than in former
 “ Prophets. And that this is the avow’d

Scheme of the *Socinians*, and particularly
 the *English* ones, I shall fully evince, by
 referring the Reader to a *Socinian* Book, *Publisch’d*
 Entitled, *Considerations on the Explications of* *in 4to,*
the Doctrine of the Trinity, that had been *1694. p.*
 advanced *45.*

advanced by our most eminent Writers during the Heat of the *Socinian* Controversy : Where the Words just now cited, as the same with Mr. *Emlin's* Doctrine, are laid down as the great distinguishing Principle of the *Socinian* Scheme. And consequently, whatever Mr. *Whiston* may pretend, Mr. *Emlin* must give up all his Arguments that proceed upon the *Socinian*, and not the *Arian* Scheme ; or else own that he has declined the Name of *Socinian*, just as *Christ. Sandius* did that of *Arian* ; who tho' he wrote an Ecclesiastical History " to prove that all Antiquity was *Arian*, " in all his Books refuses (in Words) to be " called either *Arian* or *Socinian*." But with what Ingenuity this may have been practised by either or both of them, I leave the World to Judge.

See Brief
History of
Unitari-
ans, 4^{to}.
1691. p.
12.

But to return from this long, tho' necessary Digression, about Mr. *Emlin's* Opinion, to Mr. *Whiston* the unhappy occasion of it. He, with all that good Breeding by which he is so eminently distinguish'd, was pleas'd to charge me with asserting so great an Untruth, as that Mr. *Emlin* was a *Socinian*, and to assure me that to his Knowledge he is none. For the Justice of which Censure I refer the Reader to the Quotations above out of Mr. *Emlin's* Writings. But Mr. *Whiston* goes on, and roundly determines, that so great an Untruth has been asserted, the

Second
Rep. to Dr.
All. p. 42.

Ibid.

more

more securely to impute *Blasphemy* to him. But was not Mr. *Emlin* in matter of fact, Condemn'd for *Blasphemy* in *Ireland*, as the *Reflector* asserted? Yes, besides other proper means of Information, I have so good a Witness to produce for it as Mr. *Whiston* himself, who elsewhere acknowledges in express Terms that Mr. *Emlin* was found guilty of no less a Crime than *Blasphemy*. So that in opposition to Mr. *Whiston* I am acquitted of a false Charge by Mr. *Whiston* himself. But besides the Legal Sentence of Mr. *Emlin*, I shall venture to continue the Charge of *Blasphemy*, both upon Mr. *Whiston* and Mr. *Emlin*, from the nature of the thing itself; since in point of Reason, it is at least equal *Blasphemy* to Un-deify a God, and Deify a Creature.

See Proc.
of Convoc.
p. 32.

What Mr. *Whiston* farther mentions about the *Subordination* of the Son to the Father, as approv'd by the present Convocation, and at the same time as approaching very near to Mr. *Emlin's* Doctrine of *Inequality*, I leave to the Cognizance of that Learned Body, who no doubt will vindicate themselves from so foul an Aspersion. And I think it sufficient at present to assert, that the only *Inequality* of the Son to the Father allow'd of by the Catholick Church is *Oeconomical*, or that of Order and Origination, and not of *Inferiority* in Nature, two things Mr. *Whiston* is very willing to Confound;

Second Rep.
to Dr. All.
p. 42.

as appears evidently from their acknowledgment of the Son to be *Co-essential* and *Co-eternal* with the Father. So that tho' the Church allows that the Son is *Subordinate* to the Father, it denies his *Inferiority*, by declaring him to be *equal to the Father as touching his Godhead*. And this is the *Doctrine of Subordination*, which, tho' Mr. *Whiston* informs us it is now becoming the *Doctrine of this Church*, was the *Ancient Doctrine of the Three first as well as following Centuries*, as the *Excellent Defender of the Nicene Faith* has evinced beyond all reasonable Contradiction.

Vid. Cl.
Bulli De-
fens. Fid.
Nic. p.
251, 258,
280. Edit.
Grab.

To Conclude, as I find in *Controversial Combats*, as well as in the *Modern Art of War*, the most likely way to obtain Victory is to bear all the *Enemy's Fire*, and then attack them; so I shall with ease bear all the *Rude-nesses* Mr. *Whiston* has thrown out upon me, and with a *Superiour Contempt* of his little Arts in *Disputing* as well as *Angry Menaces*, shall pass them by, and turn his *Artillery* upon himself. He has been pleased, in the last place, to desire me to Consider, what will be my *Crime another Day*, (meaning the *Day of Judgment*, of which he had reminded me just before) if I at last should prove to be mistaken, if his supposed *Blasphemies* should prove to be *Sacred Truths*, and if the *Constitutions and Doctrine of the Apostles* should prove to be *genuine*; to which as several

Second Re-
ply p. 42.

Ibid.

ral

ral things might be said, that shall be here
 omitted, in behalf of a sincere Conviction,
 founded on the undoubted *Scriptures*, as ex-
 plained by the *Primitive Church* and that genu-
 ine *Antiquity* that is come down to our Age ;
 so I shall here content my self with retorting
 Mr. *Whiston's* Argument drawn from the *Day*
of Judgment upon his own Head, and (un-
 less I flatter my self) with great Advantage.
 I beg of him therefore to consider what will be
 his *Crime another Day*, when he shall appear
 before the Majesty of *him*, whom from a God
 he endeavour'd to Degrade into a *Creature* ;
 before *him*, I say, whose great design of
 rooting out *Idolatry* he has Contradicted, by
 maintaining the *Worship* of a *Made and Cre-*
ated God ; before *him*, the benefit of whose
Redemption he hopes for, but yet has dared
 to overthrow the foundation of its Merits,
 that arise from the invaluable Sacrifice of a
 Person of that high Dignity as the great
 God-Man, and in presumptuous oppositi-
 on to his own Revelation, has refused to
 own that he is *purchased by the Blood of God* ; *Acts 20.*
 and to add no more Aggravations, before *him*, *v. 28.*
 whose *Body* the Church he has Distracted
 and Scandalized, by rendring *dubious* their
Rule of Faith the Holy *Scriptures*, by giving
 the preference to Pretended *Constitutions* and
 false *Doctrine of the Apostles*, and applying all
 his Talents to the support of Forgeries and
 Impostures as of *Sacred Authority*. These
 are

are shocking Thoughts indeed : and therefore not to dwell longer upon them, I shall conclude with Praying to the affronted Saviour of the World, that my Unhappy Adversary may so Judge himself at present, as not to be Condemned with the Unbelieving World at that dreadful Tribunal; and that both he and I (notwithstanding all our Mistakes and Infirmities) may be Accepted in that Day, through the infinite Merits of the great God-man, Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

F I N I S.



ERRATA. *In the Reflections on Mr. Whiston's Conduct in his Revival of the Arian Heresy.*

PAg. 13. for *eis* read *eis*. p. 14. l. 15. after *each* r. *other*. p. 32. l. 13. for *one* (who according, read *one* who (according.

ERRATA. *In this Vindication of those Reflections.*

PAg. 19. l. 23. after the words from the dele the Comma. p. 10 l. 6. for *in Expressions* read *in the Expressions*. p. 17. l. 31. for *this Learned*, read *his Learned*. p. 20. l. 19. for *Ischiras* read. *Ischyra*. p. 21. l. 3. after *Enemies*: put a Comma. p. 26. l. 23. and 28. for *for ἀπαιτα* read *ἀπαιτα*. p. 29. l. 29. for *ἐναστος ἐναστος*. p. 37. l. 12. after *is* read *it*. p. 38. l. 20. for *ἐκτῆσας* read *ἐκτῆσας*. p. 42. l. 26. dele a before *Astonishment*. *Ibid.* l. 30. for *Semul* read *Semel*.

Other small Faults which disturb not the Sense, are left to the Reader's Candor.

l
-
-
-
g
tt
r
d
of

1's

rr.
ic-

ti-

p.

p.

19.

t d

p.

ite

lele

est

